

CIRCUIT COURTS

Budget Summary						FTE Position Summary				
Fund	2014-15 Adjusted Base	Request		2015-17 Change Over Base Year Doubled		2014-15	Request		2016-17 Over 2014-15	
		2015-16	2016-17	Amount	%		2015-16	2016-17	Number	%
GPR	\$95,603,500	\$106,344,400	\$106,344,400	\$21,481,800	11.2%	527.00	527.00	527.00	0.00	0.0%
PR	232,700	232,700	232,700	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N.A.
TOTAL	\$95,836,200	\$106,577,100	\$106,577,100	\$21,481,800	11.2%	527.00	527.00	527.00	0.00	0.0%

Major Request Items

1. STANDARD BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS

GPR	\$3,733,600
-----	-------------

Request \$1,866,800 annually associated with full funding of salaries and fringe benefits.

2. ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR CIRCUIT COURT SUPPORT AND GUARDIAN AD LITEM PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES

GPR	\$17,298,200
-----	--------------

Request \$8,649,100 annually to increase support for the circuit court support payment program (\$7,454,500 annually) and the guardian ad litem payment program (\$1,194,600 annually) to provide more financial assistance to counties. Under current law, \$18,552,200 is budgeted annually for circuit court support payments, distributed as follows: (a) each county receives a base payment of \$42,275 per branch/judge; (b) an additional \$10,000 to each county with one or fewer circuit court branches; and (c) payment equal to the county's proportion of the state population times the remaining funding. The request would increase the base payment of \$42,275 per branch to \$71,500 per branch. For the guardian ad litem program, \$1,433,500 GPR is currently budgeted and distributed based on each county's proportion of: (a) court branches; (b) revenue generated by the court support services fee; and (c) cases that would likely involve guardian ad litem services as determined by the Director of State Courts.

3. COURT INTERPRETER REIMBURSEMENT

GPR	\$450,000
-----	-----------

Request \$225,000 annually for increased funding for court interpreter reimbursement. Further, request a statutory language modification to provide state reimbursement at a per diem rate, rather than an hourly rate. Under current law, the state reimburses counties for court interpreter costs at a rate of: (a) \$40 for the first hour and \$20 for each additional half-hour for certified interpreters; and (b) \$40 for the first hour and \$15 for each additional half-hour for qualified interpreters. The request would provide reimbursement at: (a) \$160 per half-day (four

hours) and \$320 per day (eight hours) for certified interpreters; and (b) \$ \$120 per half-day (four hours) and \$240 per day (eight hours) for qualified interpreters.

4. NON-STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR TWO-YEAR CENTRALIZED INTERPRETER STATION PILOT

Request non-statutory authority to establish a two-year court interpreter pilot project for a centralized interpreter station for three pilot counties to support scheduling, and video and telephone interpreting services. Under the pilot, the selected counties would enter a memorandum of understanding with the Director of State Courts to turn over interpreter scheduling to the centralized scheduler and agree to use video and telephone interpreting services as scheduled. During the pilot, counties would not receive state reimbursement, but also would not incur any costs for using interpreter services, other than costs for maintaining the video conferencing and telephonic equipment at the courthouse. The current court interpreter sum certain appropriation would, however, be used by the state to support the cost of interpreters used in the pilot counties. Funding for the pilot would be used for: (a) video conferencing equipment; (b) a limited-term employee scheduler/coordinator; (c) a limited-term employee Spanish interpreter; and (d) contracting for a sign language interpreter. According to the Director of State Courts Office, pilot counties would include a rural county, a mid-sized county, and an urban county selected from those that volunteer to participate "based on their previous interpreter usage and interpreter costs, as well as the existing technology and network connectivity capable of supporting quality remote interpreter services. ...It is anticipated that the increased pilot costs for currently non-reimbursable interpreter costs and administrative costs will be offset by the efficiencies gained through the pilot model so additional funds are not being requested."